

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-15, which were all of the then pending claims, under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,605,122 (Hearn, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,081,263 (LeGall, et al.).

For the reasons discussed below, the rejection of Claims 1-15 is respectfully traversed. Also, this opportunity is being taken to amend Claims 3, 8, and 13 to better define the subject matters of these claims; and new Claims 16-18, which are dependent from Claim 1, are being added to describe preferred features of the invention.

The rejection of Claims 1-15 is traversed because the cited references do not disclose or suggest the procedure, described in independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 for naming the web page.

To elaborate, the present invention relates to methods and systems for changing pages of web sites. An important objective of the invention is to allow a content manager to make in real time changes to a web page that previously may have taken an application developer hours or days to implement.

Generally, this is done by means of a form that reads configuration characteristics from a configuration document for the page, retrieves data from a data view, and then places that data on the web page in accordance with the read configuration characteristics.

In accordance with the invention, an address is formed for the page from the name of the above-discussed form. The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest forming the page name in this way.

For example, Hearn, et al. discloses a procedure for integrating data into a common environment. However, as the Examiner has recognized, Hearn, et al. does not disclose forming a page address in the above-described manner.

In order to overcome this deficiency of Hearn, et al. as a reference, the Examiner cited LeGall, et al. as disclosing page addresses. Applicants respectfully submit that the particular portion of the LeGall, et al. specification, column 5, lines 29-33, cited by the Examiner does not actually teach forming a page address. Moreover, LeGall, et al. does not disclose forming a page address in the manner in which they are formed in the present invention.

Importantly, in this invention, the page name is not formed simply from the name of any form, but from the name of a specific form — the same form that reads the configuration characteristics, retrieves the data, and then places the data on the web page in accordance with those configuration characteristics. This LeGall, et al. does not disclose or suggest.

Independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 clearly describe this aspect of the invention. Specifically, each of these claims describe the feature that the page address is formed from the name of the same form that is used to read the configuration characteristics, retrieve the data, and place that data on the web page in accordance with those configuration characteristics.

This feature is of utility because, as will be appreciated, it provides a simple way of accessing the form and using that form to reconfigure the web page from the web page itself.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, also fail to disclose or suggest this feature of the invention.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6 and 11 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-5 and 16-18 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith. Similarly, Claims 7-10 are dependent from Claim 6 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 12-15 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 11. The Examiner is, thus, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-18.

Every effort has been made to place this case in condition for allowance, a notice of which is requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman
Registration No. 34,594
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

SF:JSS:jy